

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Notice dated February 2, 2010 and in further response to the Office Action dated April 7, 2009, which set a three-month period for response. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application.

In the Notice of February 2, 2010, the amendment filed on October 5, 2009 was objected to as not fully responsive to the prior Office Action on grounds that the rejection of claims 11-15 was not addressed. The present submission addresses this objection.

In the Office Action of April 7, 2009, the specification, drawings, and claims 4 and 10 were objected to for informalities. Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,538,352 to Asao.

In the present response to the Notice of February 2, 2010, claim 11 has been amended to define over the Asao reference by including the feature of the stator iron 17 and that *the winding ends (78) do not pass between the stator iron (17) and the clamp-like junction region (81) in an axial direction, but pass obliquely between the stator iron (17) and the clamp-like junction region (81)*. Support for this language can be found in the original specification on page 10, lines 11-21.


The cited reference to Asao does not disclose, show or suggest winding ends that extend obliquely between a stator iron and a clamp-like junction region, as defined in amended claim 11.

Dependent claims 12-15, all of which depend on claim 11, likewise are patentable over Asao on the same basis.

Because amended claim 11 includes features that are not disclosed by Asao, the rejection under Section 102 must be withdrawn. The Applicants further submits that Asao is not a proper reference under 35 USC 102 pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the last paragraph of MPEP section 2131, where it is stated that *“a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”, and that “the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim”*.

The application as amended herein and in the response of October 5, 2009 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 27233

103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700